



G A O

Accountability * Integrity * Reliability

United States General Accounting Office
Washington, DC 20548

June 5, 2002

The Honorable Harold Rogers
Chairman
The Honorable Martin Olav Sabo
Ranking Minority Member
Subcommittee on Transportation
and Related Agencies
Committee on Appropriations
House of Representatives

Subject: Highway Projects: Extent of Unobligated Balances for Demonstration Projects as of March 31, 2002

Congress has provided funding for numerous highway demonstration projects in legislation authorizing surface transportation programs as well as in annual appropriations acts for the Department of Transportation (DOT). In some cases, the projects are identified in the legislation itself. In others, they are identified in committee reports accompanying the legislation. These projects are all designated for specific locations within states and for specific purposes, and funds made available for them generally remain available until expended. In order to identify funds that could be rescinded, you asked us to identify highway demonstration projects with unobligated balances that are no longer needed, and the amount of these balances.

Results

As of March 31, 2002, there were 30 highway demonstration projects with unobligated balances that were no longer needed by the states.¹ These projects accounted for about \$5.6 million in unobligated funds. These funds were provided in authorization or appropriations acts enacted from 1978 through 1994. Table 1 in the enclosure specifies the budget authority made available and the obligated and unobligated amounts for each of the projects with unobligated balances as of March 31, 2002; lists the statute(s) and, where appropriate, committee report(s) identifying the projects, beginning with the most recent, and describes briefly the location and nature of the projects. We also found that 8 of the 30 projects have very small unobligated balances of less than \$1.50 each, and we have provided that information to your staff.

¹ We identified another set of demonstration projects with unobligated balances in 2001. See *Highway Projects: Extent of Unobligated Balances for Demonstration Projects* (GAO-01-985R, Aug. 17, 2001.)

Scope and Methodology

To identify highway demonstration projects with unobligated balances, we requested that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) analyze reports from DOT's fiscal management information system (FMIS) and verify the information with state officials. We verified the statutory sources of the projects and their descriptions by reviewing the statutes and associated reports. We relied on FMIS to identify the amount of budget authority and obligated and unobligated amounts for each project and did not independently verify this information. We conducted our review in April and May 2002 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

Agency Comments

We provided DOT with a draft of this letter for review and comment. DOT agreed with the information in the draft letter and provided technical comments, which we incorporated as appropriate.

As agreed with your office, unless you publicly announce its contents earlier, we plan no further distribution of this letter until 30 days after the draft of the report. At that time, we will send copies of this letter to the Secretary of Transportation, the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The letter will also be available on GAO's Web site at <http://www.gao.gov>.

If you have any questions or need assistance, please contact me or Katherine Siggerud at (202) 512-2834. Other key contributors to this letter were Alex Lawrence and Bonnie Pignatiello Leer.



JayEtta Hecker
Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues

Enclosure

Enclosure

Table 1: Summary of Demonstration Projects with Unobligated Balances (as of March 31, 2002)

State	Public law, section, and related report	Project description	Budget authority	Obligations	Unobligated balance
Ohio	Public Law 103-331 (1994) <i>Surface Transportation Projects</i> House Conference Report 103-752	Intermodal terminal, Fearing Boulevard, Toledo, Ohio	\$668,000.00	\$0.00	\$668,000.00
Virginia	Public Law 103-331 (1994) <i>Surface Transportation Projects</i> House Conference Report 103-752	14th Street bridge lane addition, Virginia	1,000,000.00	829,849.00	170,151.00
Florida	Public Law 102-388 (1992) <i>Highway Projects (Highway Trust Fund)</i> House Conference Report 102-924	Biscayne Boulevard/U.S. 1, connect Port/Miami to Interstate 395	2,400,000.00	1,808,927.00	591,073.00
Washington, D.C.	Public Law 102-240 (1991) (§1107(b)(201))	Advanced composite bridge deck demonstration at Catholic University	195,085.00	0.00	195,085.00
Illinois	Public Law 102-240 (1991) (§1106(b)(2)(13))	Joliet, Illinois: for rehabilitation of Houbolt Road from Jefferson Street to Joliet Junior College and construction and interchange at Houbolt Road and Interstate 80	975,428.00	818,828.60	156,599.40
Illinois	Public Law 102-240 (1991) (§1107 (b)(105))	U.S. 24 road replacement: Crescent City to Illinois 1 in Watseka; 6.3 miles	2,438,571.00	2,193,619.54	244,951.46
Illinois	Public Law 102-240 (1991) (§1106(a)(2)(9))	East St. Louis, Illinois: feasibility study for 4-lane Access Road to Jefferson Memorial Park	234,103.00	0.00	234,103.00
Minnesota	Public Law 102-240 (1991) (§1107(b)(160))	St. Cloud, Minnesota: Trunk Highway 15 bridge across Mississippi River and interchange with Trunk Highway 10	3,160,388.00	3,079,685.88	80,702.12
Ohio	Public Law 102-240 (1991) (§1106(a)(2)(86))	Route 18 Bypass study, Medina, Ohio	390,172.00	0.00	390,172.00
North Dakota	Public Law 102-143 (1991) <i>Highway Demonstration Projects</i> House Conference Report 102-243	Highway beautification, Grand Forks, North Dakota	800,000.00	785,010.31	14,989.69

Enclosure

State	Public law, section, and related report	Project description	Budget authority	Obligations	Unobligated balance
New Jersey	Public Law 102-143 (1991) <i>Highway Studies, Feasibility-- Design, Environmental, Engineering</i> House Conference Report 102-243	Highway Study – Route 208/Route 4 interchange, New Jersey	\$4,000,000.00	\$1,308,726.22	\$2,691,273.78
Oregon	Public Law 102-143 (1991) <i>Highway Demonstration Projects</i> House Conference Report 102-243	Highway 101 Tri-State Feasibility Study ^a	270,000.00	217,309.88	52,690.12
Washington	Public Law 102-143 (1991) <i>Highway Demonstration Projects</i> House Conference Report 102-243	Bryden Canyon Bridge access, Clarkston, Washington	3,600,000.00	3,585,502.46	14,497.54
	Public Law 102-240 (1991) (§1107(b)(39))	Bryden, Washington: construct 3 miles of new and improved highways connecting Clarkston, Washington, with Lewiston, Idaho	3,804,171.00	3,798,028.84	6,142.16
Illinois	Public Law 101-516 (1990) <i>Highway Demonstration Projects</i> House Conference Report 101-892 Public Law 102-143 (1991) <i>Highway Demonstration Projects</i> House Conference Report 102-243	Bridge Construction – Hillsboro, Illinois	1,280,000.00	1,212,660.05	67,339.95
Arkansas	Public Law 101-516 (1990) <i>Highway Demonstration Projects-- Preliminary Engineering</i> House Conference Report 101-892	Interstate 66 Feasibility Study ^b	10,000.00	8,169.00	1,831.00

Enclosure

State	Public law, section, and related report	Project description	Budget authority	Obligations	Unobligated balance
Kentucky	Public Law 101-516 (1990) <i>Highway Demonstration Projects-- Preliminary Engineering</i> House Conference Report 101-892	Interstate 66 Feasibility Study ^b	\$10,000.00	\$7,118.19	\$2,881.81
Ohio	Public Law 101-516 (1990) <i>Highway Demonstration Projects-- Preliminary Engineering</i> House Conference Report 101-892	Interstate 66 Feasibility Study ^b	2,500.00	0.00	2424.00
Texas	Public Law 101-516 (1990) <i>Highway Demonstration Projects-- Preliminary Engineering</i> House Conference Report 101-892	Interstate 66 Feasibility Study ^b	2,500.00	92.87	2,407.13
Utah	Public Law 101-516 (1990) <i>Highway Demonstration Projects-- Preliminary Engineering</i> House Conference Report 101-892	Interstate 66 Feasibility Study ^b	10,000.00	6,365.04	3,634.96
Virginia	Public Law 101-516 (1990) <i>Highway Demonstration Projects-- Preliminary Engineering</i> House Conference Report 101-892	Interstate 66 Feasibility Study ^b	10,000.00	4,208.00	5,792.00
West Virginia	Public Law 101-516 (1990) <i>Highway Demonstration Projects-- Preliminary Engineering</i> House Conference Report 101-892	Interstate 66 Feasibility Study ^b	10,000.00	0.00	10,000.00

Enclosure

State	Public law, section, and related report	Project description	Budget authority	Obligations	Unobligated balance
Illinois	Public Law 97-424 (1983) (§131(j)(1) ^c)	A demonstration project for the purpose of showing the benefits of constructing usable segments of high-volume facilities and developing methods to achieve the effective implementation of massive capital investments made under federal programs that are being discontinued.	97,663,821.08	97,661,227.33	2,593.75
Total			\$122,934,739.08	\$117,325,328.21	\$5,609,334.87

^aAccording to FHWA, The study included Oregon, California, and Washington.

^bAccording to FHWA, the study was originally authorized \$1,275,000 and included 15 states: Arkansas, Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and West Virginia. This report includes unobligated balances for this project in seven of these states.

^cPublic Law 97-424 originally authorized \$100,000,000 for this project. FHWA officials told us that subsequently, in accordance with Public Law 99-177 (1985), the project's budget authority was reduced to \$98,925,000. Public Law 104-59 (1995) rescinded \$798,701 of the funds that had been made available for this project. We identified a \$462,478 unobligated balance for this project in Highway Projects: Extent of Unobligated Balances for Demonstration Projects, (GAO-01-985R, August 17, 2001) and this was rescinded pursuant to Public Law 107-120 (2001). Subsequently, Illinois identified an additional \$2,593.75 unobligated balance.

Source: Adapted by GAO from information provided by the FHWA.